

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 4, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 9 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 19 and 11 contain allowable subject matter. By means of the present amendment, claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form without including features of intervening claim 4 as they are believed to be not necessary for patentability. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 9 be allowed. In addition, as claim 11 depends from independent claim 9, Applicant respectfully requests that claim 11 also be allowed.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-8, 13-15 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,235,255 (Blom). claims 1-5, 7-8, 13-15 and 16-18

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,187,414 (Fellows). Further, claims 6, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellows in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,178 (Lev).

In response, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to include certain features of claims 2 and 16. Accordingly, no new issues requiring a new search have been introduced and entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8, 10 and 12-18 are patentable over Blom, Fellows and Lev for at least the following reasons.

Blom is directed to a circuit arrangement for operating a discharge lamp with a substantially constant power by periodically switching a FET of switch mode power supply. The FET is driven with a drive signal derived from a signal S1 provided from a signal generator (IV) shown in FIG 1, and shown in greater detail in FIG 2. As shown in FIG 2, the signal S1 is derived by comparing the sum of three voltages as nodes C, B, D with a reference voltage.

Fellows is directed to an electronic controller for fluorescent lamps. The Fellows controller includes a DC to AC converter which supplies high frequency current to the lamp, and a

switched mode power supply. The switched mode power supply and the DC to AC converter are synchronized to operate in a fixed phase relationship and/or at the same frequency.

It is respectfully submitted that, Blom and Fellows, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 15 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

control means for controlling the switched-on and switched-off states of said power switching element for controlling the power or current supplied to the high-pressure discharge lamp;

wherein the control means are adapted to control the power consumed by the lamp during its steady phase or the current consumed by the lamp during its run-up phase by controlling the on-time ( $T_{on}$ ) of the switched-on state of the at least one power switching element, wherein a value of the on-time ( $T_{on}$ ) of the at least one power switching element is a preset value associated with the discharge lamp used.

Using a preset on-time associated with the discharge lamp is nowhere taught or suggested in Blom, Fellows, and combination thereof. Rather, Blom uses a drive derived from comparing the sum of voltages with reference voltage, while Fellows teaches to synchronize a switched mode power supply with a DC to AC converter.


Lev is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Blom and Fellows.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 15 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8, 10, 12-14 and 16-18 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1 and 15.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
May 16, 2007

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101